

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 and 18-58 are present in this application. Claims 16, 18-38, and 58 have been examined. Claims 16, 28, and 37 are independent claims.

In view of the above Amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Independent claims 28 and 37 are allowed, and dependent claim 22 is allowable, if rewritten into independent form.

### **§ 102(b) Rejection – Yudasaka**

Claims 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 29-34, and 58 have been rejected under 35U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 06-011729 (Yudasaka; previously applied). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 16 had been amended to include the feature “wherein a nearest surface of the non-single-crystal thin-film and a nearest surface of the single-crystal silicon thin-film are at different heights above the insulating substrate.” The basis of the amendment is shown in, for example, present Figs. 1-3, which show a single-crystal thin film (14a, 14b), a non-single-crystal thin film 5’ and a non-crystalline silicon thin film 5 provided at different heights above the insulating substrate 2.

The Office Action refers to the Abstract in Yudasaka as teaching that the single crystal layers are thicker than the polycrystalline structure. The Office Action concludes that because one layer is thicker than the other, then the heights would be different. However, such an interpretation was not intended by the Applicants.

In order to clarify the intended interpretation of claim 16, claim 16 has been amended to define “nearest surface” as being the surface “nearest to the insulating substrate.” Claim 16 also

clarifies that unlike Yudasaka, the films are separated from the insulating substrate by a space or other layers, e.g., insulating film 3 etc. Yudasaka shows the single-crystal silicon film 202(302) and the polycrystalline or non-crystalline silicon film 204(304) mounted directly on a transparent insulating substrate 201(301).

Based on the amendments to claim 16 to clarify the intended interpretation, Applicants submit that Yudasaka does not anticipate the invention of claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### Claim 21

Claim 21 recites a further feature that a thickness of a single-crystal silicon thin film of the MOS thin-film transistor is about not more than 100nm.

The Office Action alleges that Yudasaka at para. 0017 teaches the thickness of the single crystal silicon thin film is not more than 100 nm. Applicants submit that the Office Action has misinterpreted the teachings of the Yudasaka reference.

The thickness of 1000 ' mentioned in para. 0017 pertains to the thickness of a polycrystal silicone film or amorphous silicone film 303 deposited at a thickness of 1000 ' as shown in drawing 3(c). Further evidence of this fact can be seen in para. 0016, where Yudasaka discloses that it is necessary to make thickness of a single crystal silicone film thick, and suggests that single crystal silicone films 202 and 203 be made 5000 ' or more, while the amorphous silicone film 204 is made into 1000 ' or less.

Thus, Applicants submit that Yudasaka fails to teach or suggest at least the feature recited in claim 21. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to anticipate claim 21. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

#### Claim 58

Claim 58 recites a further feature that the single-crystal silicon thin-film device is bonded with the insulating substrate via an intervening inorganic insulating film.

The Office Action alleges that para. 0013 teaches the claimed intervening inorganic insulating film. To the contrary, paragraph 0013 merely discloses that single crystal silicone film 102 is formed on the insulating substrate 101. Yudasaka does not disclose an intervening insulating film between the single crystal thin film and the insulating substrate anywhere in the application (for example, see all drawings).

Thus, Applicants submit that Yudasaka fails to teach or suggest at least the feature recited in claim 58. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection fails to anticipate claim 58. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 58 be withdrawn.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Yudasaka, Spitzer**

Claims 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yudasaka in view of Spitzer (previously applied). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 25-27 are dependent claims, indirectly dependent on claim 16. Applicants submit that Spitzer fails to make up for the above stated deficiencies in claim 16. Thus, Applicants submit that at least for the reasons above for claim 16, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 25-27, as well.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Yudasaka, Okabe**

Claims 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yudasaka in view of U.S. Patent 5,663,099 (Okabe; previously applied). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 35 and 36 are dependent claims on claim 16. Applicants submit that Okabe fails to make up for the above stated deficiencies in claim 16. Thus, Applicants submit that at least for the reasons above for claim 16, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 35 and 36, as well.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert Downs, Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48,222

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant